



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

'please,' 'raise,' 'praise,' 'seize,' 'seethe,' 'soothe,' 'advertise,' and others, are not accompanied by surd nouns.

Many words are used both as nouns and verbs, without a change of form, such as 'glide,' 'rise,' 'slide,' 'slice,' 'scoff,' 'pace,' 'race,' 'revise,' 'exercise.'

In some cases a change of form would cause confusion with other words, as in 'cease' 'seize,' 'loose' 'lose,' 'bite' 'bide,' 'rip' 'rib,' 'dose' 'doze,' 'hiss' 'his,' 'lease' 'lees,' where the z-sound as a plural sign adds to the confusion.

III.—On Begemann's Views as to the Weak Preterit of the Germanic Verbs.

By FRANKLIN CARTER,

PROFESSOR OF THE GERMAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN YALE COLLEGE.

THE so-called weak preterit in the Germanic verbs has long been regarded as composed of the stem of the verb and the past tense of a strong verb from the root found in *da* in the Latin *condēre*, *ἐν* in the Greek *τιθημι*, and in the Sanskrit *dhā*. This belief dates from the sharp investigations of Grimm, whose influence induced Bopp to abandon his previously adopted view of the derivation of this weak preterit from the past participle, and to accept the theory of composition. Bopp's supposition of the derivation of these preterits from the participle was doubtless suggested by the resemblance between these forms. This resemblance is marked in the regular verbs, but is striking in those verbs which form somewhat irregularly their preterit tense and past participle, viz. : the preteritive and a few others. Of the preteritive, *magan* (preterit *mahta*, participle *mahts*) may serve as an example. Of the others, *pugkjan* (preterit *thuhta*, participle *thuhts*). This resemblance is at first notice the most striking feature of these forms; and, as we have mentioned, it seemed at first to Bopp neither accidental nor incidental, but organic. The sharper sighted Grimm discovered a resemblance between

these preterits and another form, so peculiar as to convey to his mind a notion of kindred more deeply rooted than that which was implied by the simple agreement of form between the preterit and the participle. This was the perfect agreement of the inflection endings in the dual and plural of the regular weak perfects with the endings which a strong verb of the second class from a stem ending in *d* would have in the preterit, and which the lengthened stem *bidjan* actually presents in the preterit. This resemblance becomes clear by a comparison of the preterits.

Strong preterit, from *bidjan*.

bap
bast
bap
bêdu
bêduts
bêdum
bêdup
bêdun

Weak preterit, from *nasjan*.

nasida
nasidês
nasida
nasidêdu
nasidêduts
nasidêdum
nasidêdup
nasidêdum

A resemblance so complete in the dual and plural naturally suggests an extension to the singular ; and, time being given for the wearing away of the endings in the singular, what better hypothesis is there for the origin of the tense than the composition of the stem of the verb *nasjan* with the strong preterit *dad*, *dast*, *dad*, *dêdu*, *dêduts*, *dêdum*, *dêdup*, *dêdum*? What is more natural than to refer to a stem allied with the Sanskrit *dha* and with $\vartheta\eta$ in $\tau\iota\vartheta\eta\mu$, this not wholly imaginary preterit, whose meaning, 'fixed' or 'placed,' combined with that of the stem of the verb whose preterit is to be analyzed, makes out in many cases so perfect a signification for the transitive preterit? This we know to have been Grimm's process of mind ; and this explanation is so strongly supported by analogous facts in the history of language, especially as the evolutionists present that history, that the theory of composition has been practically unquestioned for fifty years.

Lately, however, the number of students in this field has increased, and the weight of those first names has somewhat lessened under the influence of discoveries and new theories, and naturally there is new investigation of principles long

accepted. This hypothesis of Grimm's has, like others of long standing, been weighed anew. Begemann, one of the professors at the Academy for Modern Languages in Berlin, published in 1873 an able and learned pamphlet attacking the composition theory as affecting these preterits, and followed it up by a second treatise in 1874. The first pamphlet deals with the difficulties under which the composition theory labors or is said to labor, and proposes anew Bopp's first theory, that of derivation from the participle, applying it, however, to the dual and the plural, as well as to the singular. The second pamphlet deals largely with the possibility (strongly denied by many defenders of the old theory) of the derivation of an active transitive preterit from a passive participle, though many of the arguments of the first treatise are restated and newly fortified in the second.

One of the difficulties for the Grimm hypothesis of composition arises from the fact that it is at best no more than an hypothesis. As a theory to account for changes that took place in a period without literary records, it can never be anything but an hypothesis, probable enough, but never a demonstrated certainty. The same thing, however, must be said in regard to any other method of accounting for the formation of these preterits; and the question is, therefore, one of a choice between hypotheses. Which has in its favor more facts from the general field of linguistic growth and from the special field of the Germanic tongues?

It should be stated in the outset that the theory of composition advanced by Grimm and generally approved by Germanic scholars may be accepted in its outline, without committing the acceptor to any one of the dozen different methods by which the details of the composition and its development have been evolved. One may fully believe in the validity of the composition theory, without accepting either Grimm's theory of an original ending *a* for the first person preterit singular of all strong verbs, or Holtzmann's original ending *dida* for the first person singular of the weak preterit, or Scherer's aorist in old German, or Grein's original *dads* for the second person singular, or Meyer's root *dadh*. Had the formation taken shape in a

period on which literary records throw a clear light, the hypothesis either would become a demonstrated certainty, like the composition of the future and conditional in the Romance languages, or would be disproved. Conjectures in either event would be valueless. But these conjectures, worthless in such a condition, have for us now the value of possible modes of origin; and though nearly every investigator has failed at some point to provide full analogies from the Gothic or other Germanic tongues for each supposed process, yet the strength of one may perhaps in some relation be made to supplement the weakness of another; and certainly the pure and simple theory does not involve one of the crude evolutions which have been thrust upon it. It is then no overturning of the theory itself, if the bizarre methods of development which have been applied by indiscreet defenders in order to sustain it, are overthrown. Begemann has brought to this work a keen critical faculty, and the oversights and solecisms of all supporters of the composition doctrine are thoroughly exposed. An oversight, for instance, was without doubt the assertion of Bopp, that "in the second person singular of the Old High German *tâti* from *tatati* begins already the misunderstanding, and only the first and third persons, *têta*, 'I did,' 'he did,' preserve the ancient standpoint with distinct and simple reduplication-syllable." For Bopp assumes for Gothic a stem *dad*, resting on an old reduplication of which the language is no longer conscious, and deduces from the plural *dādun* of the Old High German a secondary root *dād* and a present *didu*, and thus third person plural *dadadun*, contracted to *daadun*, *dādun*. Now Begemann shows (and has, by correcting Bopp, done service for the friends of the composition theory) by a careful comparison of the preterit forms occurring in the oldest documents from Old Saxon *duan*, Anglo-Saxon *dôn*, that the forms like *dēda* and *dide*, which have been taken by some supporters of the composition theory to be early reduplicated forms, must be relatively late, and that the earlier forms were of the strong conjugation. In other words, just what the weak preterit in the Gothic verbs seems plainly to imply, viz.: that an auxiliary from the past of a strong verb

has been received by and incorporated with the stem in *nasi-da*, *-dês*, *-da*, *-dêdu*, *-dêduts*, *-dêdum*, *-dêdup*, *-dêdun*, is borne out by a comparison in Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon of the earliest preterit forms of this auxiliary verb. The form *dadi* must be earlier than *dedôs* and *dêdun*, earlier than *dêdum*; and the verbal forms *dæde* and *dædon*, adduced by Grein, *should be* the remains of the strong verb in Anglo-Saxon. Weak forms supplanted these and, as in Old High German, so in Old Saxon, the second singular and all persons of the plural and the subjunctive bear the impress of the strong inflection. We have then in these dialects remains of that strong verb which the Gothic and Old Norse show us only in composition. We must thank Begemann that in rescuing *têta* and *dêda* from over zealous advocates of the composition theory, he has established the right relation between the double forms in Old Saxon and the Old High German. We do this without in the least accepting his supposition for the origin of *têta* in Old German. We hold that the exhibition of a reduplicated or other form of the root used to create the compound is of little importance in comparison with evidence for the composition itself; and the demonstration of an original strong preterit for the verb 'to do' in these three languages, Old Saxon, Old High German, and Anglo-Saxon (though in the latter the form rests on slender foundation from documents), is something gained for the composition theory. This may indeed prove that *nerita* is not contracted from *neri-têta*, or even that *têta* and *nerita* are precisely similar formations, but it also demonstrates that the strong tense *da*, *dês*, *da* (which most regard as shortened from *dad*, *dast*, *dad*), *dêdu*, *dêduts*, *dêdum*, *dêdup*, *dêdun*, has its analogies in the sister, if not younger, dialects. Begemann seems himself to half suspect that he has helped the cause which he would oppose, for he says at the foot of page 19: "But thereby nothing is gained for the composition, for I have above shown that Old Gothic *nasidad*, *nasidast*, *nasidad*, could only become *nasidap*, *nasidast*, *nasidap*." The passage referred to, on page 9, concludes: "The rise of *nasida* from *nasidad* by the loss of *d* cannot be conceded. Also the deduction of *dês* from *dast* stands in contradiction to analogous

forms: the verbs *qvithan*, *vairthan*, *anabiudan* have in the second person singular of the preterit *qast*, *varst*, *anabaust*. Here, and also everywhere else, has the *st* produced from a dental and *t* maintained itself. If accordingly *nasidast* had been the ground form, it would have remained uninjured. But if one would even grant the loss of the *t*, the transition from the created *das* (for *dast*) to the actually existing *dēs* would be incomprehensible." That is, the analogies of the Gothic, as they are known to us, do not favor such a change. That is all of the "unbegreiflich" which the change involves. Begemann goes on from the passage just quoted to add: "Since now, however, the forms *nasida*, *nasidēs*, *nasida*, actually exist in harmony with Old High German *nerita*, *neritōs*, *nerita*, we must unconditionally abandon the idea of composition for the singular." On page 15 of the introduction to his treatise "Zur Bedeutung des schwachen Präteritums" he adduces in order the arguments which have led him to reject the composition theory. The first is that "nowhere outside of the Gothic are the slightest traces of a composition to be discovered." In another place (p. 32) he says "surely we must presuppose everywhere (that is, in all numbers) composition and accordingly mutilation in the singular, or throughout connection with the participle and enlargement in the dual, plural, and subjunctive"! This, then, is the argument: "*Nasida* (Gothic) and *nerita* (Old High German) belong together." Again: "If *nasidēdum* is a compound, so is *nasida*, and *nerita* must also be one." Again: "The theory is false, because there is not a trace of the composition outside of the Gothic." Why should not the relation work both ways? If resemblance in form between *nerita* and *nasida* can be used against the composition theory in respect to *nasida*, because *nerita* is claimed to be no compound, why cannot the same evidence be used for composition in *nerita*, when *nasida* is claimed to be a compound, as the traces of composition in dual and plural indicate to many? This first argument begs the whole question. Begemann's own exhibition of a strong preterit from the verbs *duan* O. S., *dōn* A. S., *thuon* O. H. G., corroborates the assumed existence of an early strong preterit

dad in Gothic, whose dual and plural are perfectly presented in the regular verbs. If *nasidédum* is a composed form, Begemann himself admits that *nasida* must be composed. If *nasida* is composed, admitting that *nerita* "belongs with it," he ought to concede composition for *nerita*. Grimm held, and many now hold, that the singular *nerita* and the plurals *neritumês*, *neritut*, *neritun* show composition. It is a subjective dictum that there is no trace of a composition outside of the Gothic; and Begemann himself acknowledges that this argument by itself alone could decide nothing. Let me note in the argument that he seems to imply that there is something very like a trace of composition in the Gothic. This first argument properly stated covers the same ground as the third (p. 15 of the second treatise), but it involves much more. The third reason for rejecting the composition is the "impossibility of explaining the forms *nasida* Goth., *nerita* o. H. G., by composition." If, as the first reason declares, there is "no trace of composition outside of the Gothic," why is a single Old High German form *nerita* picked out and held up as an especial hindrance to the acceptance of the composition theory? It ought not to be. The difficulty is in the Gothic singular *nasida*; and if that difficulty were once removed, if in accordance with known laws of Gothic formation the singular *nasidad*, *nasidast*, *nasidad*, became *nasida*, *nasidês*, *nasida*, there would be traces enough of composition "outside of the Gothic." The first and third reasons are then to be reduced to the simple reiteration that it is "unbegreiflich" how *nasidad*, *nasidast*, *nasidad*, could become *nasida*, *nasidês*, *nasida*.

It is true that we find no Gothic forms older than the *nasida*, *-dês*, *-da*. Begemann holds that o. H. G. *nerita*, *-tôs*, *-ta*, are identical with them, as the *dagê* of the Gothic genitive plural strong declension is *takô* in Old High German. From the identity of these forms he infers that we must have the primeval Germanic form not so much back of these forms as in them. It is much the same line of thought when he rejects the ordinary view of the "lautverschiebung" and declares that the surd *p* in Old High German *puochê* is older than the sonant

b in Gothic *boka*. Surely it is more in accordance with the processes of language as they appear in the Indo-Germanic families, to infer rather that we have not in the singular *nasida* and *nerita* the primeval Germanic form than that we have. Attrition, mutilation, phonetic decay (whatever we call the process), would lead us to expect a *modification* of the form if composed of a stem and a strong preterit, and it is rather a surprise that no such modified form appears in the Gothic plural, than that there is such a mutilation in the Gothic singular. However, the correspondence of the endings with those of all strong preterits in the dual and plural may have produced from resemblance a tendency to continuance, and thus preserved them, while the final sonant *d* or aspirate *p* seen in the strong preterit of the supposed stem *did* (as it is elsewhere found without an immediately preceding consonant only in the preterit of *bidjan*) had little or no class feeling to maintain it and might easily be lost. It is in accordance with the very nature of violent mutilations that they take place before or rather behind all literary record of them. When once the literary record begins, the conservative force is greatly augmented, and it by no means follows that the earliest documents show us the primeval forms.

The second reason which Begemann gives for rejecting the composition and assuming origin from the participle, namely, that in all the Germanic languages since the earliest times the closest formal relation has existed between the preterit and the participle of weak verbs, certainly has a serious aspect. It was this close relation, as has been noted, which induced Bopp at first to derive the preterit from the participle. For this close similarity but three possible methods of origin can be assigned: it may be accidental, or incidental, or organic. Considering the number and completeness of the agreements, not merely in the regular verbs of each class in Gothic, but also in the preteritive verbs and in those omitting the connecting vowel in the preterit, and likewise in other Germanic languages in cases where participles exist, an accidental resemblance cannot be assumed as accounting for *all* the agreements. There remain two other possibilities.

The resemblance of form is, partly at least, either incidental or organic; that is, either it is the result of assimilations between the forms, or the one is derived from the other. Either of these suppositions would account for the resemblance. Under the influence of either the derivation of the preterit from the participle or the assimilation of the preterit to the participle, the coincidence of stem-form might be thus complete. The derivation of the participle from the preterit is not to be thought of, as the participle is the descendant of—rather the same as—the Sanskrit participle in *ta*, Greek *το, τους*, Latin *to, tus*. Begemann, in view of this uniform resemblance, holds the doctrine of assimilation to be unreasonable, and the doctrine of organic development of preterit from participle to be the only adequate solution of the form. In reality his second, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh arguments for his view are simply varying presentations of this one fact of striking resemblance between the two forms. His fourth argument is the impossibility of the origin of the primeval preterits *mah̥ta, brah̥ta, pah̥ta*, etc., from the hypothetical ground-forms *magda, braggda, pagkda*. Of course the alternative thought is, that they can be perfectly accounted for by derivation from the participle. Grimm, Bopp, Schleicher, Leo Meyer, Moritz Heyne, and Holtzmann have all given an account of processes possible to form these preteritive preterits from the stem of the verb and the ending *da*. These explanations were independently conceived and are different from each other. Begemann reviews them and finds each account inadequate or unsupported by analogies, and some, notably that of Moritz Heyne, absurd. It is easy thus to throw contempt on the theory; but the theory is not responsible for the blunders made in its defence.

It is one of Begemann's points against the theory of composition that in the Gothic and the Old Norse this supposed auxiliary (*da*) does not exist in an independent form; and in his judgment its use as part of a supposed preterit compound and its existence in the substantiv *dēds* Goth., *dād* O. S., *tāt* O. H. G., ought to have kept it alive if it originally existed. But not contented with the verb's non-

existence in Gothic and Old Norse, he devises an original non-existence for it in the earliest forms of High German and Saxon dialects, and supposes it to have been derived in these languages from the substantive *tât* O. H. G., *dād* O. S., after the separation of the two groups. Begemann's reasoning that its use as an auxiliary in the preterit would have preserved the verb, is for the Gothic and Old Norse. But the verb's existence in the Saxon and High German group weakens a little this argument. Therefore the gratuitous supposition of a late origin must abolish its early existence in the latter group. It did not occur to Begemann that the participles which in his judgment have generated the preterits must, by his argument against the original existence of a strong verb (*do*) in Gothic, be preserved. Where is the participle, for instance, that created *vissa*, the preterit of *vait*? Not in the Gothic, though the substantive *vissei* in Gothic presents a parallel to *dêds*. How could the participle generate the preterit and perish? If it could, why might not also the strong preterit of the verb 'to do' and the verb itself perish in spite of having been used to form the weak preterits?

Not satisfied with magnifying the actual sound-difficulties, which for us make the transition of the stems in the preterits of some of the preteritive verbs (when combined with the suffix *da* or *dad*) to their present form strange, Begemann invents difficulties in the case of *gamotan*, *vitan*, *kaupatjan*, by supposing that the strong preterit second person singular ended in *st* instead of *t*. The ending *st* as in *bast* (*bapt*), *vaist* (*vaitt*), has made the change from *gamot-da* or *gamot-ta* to *gamos-ta* seem natural. What support is there for the theory of a Gothic second singular ending *st*? the single anomalous reduplicated form *saisost*. Only this verb and dental stems have *st* in the second singular preterit. If the final letter of dental stems is dropped before Begemann's imaginary *st*, why should every other final stem-letter be able to turn out the *s*? When Begemann endeavors to brace himself up by the Old Norse usage, he finds no solid support. Bezenberger ("Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie," vol. 5, p. 474) has given illustrations enough to prove that *z* in the second singu-

lar of the Old Norse preterit is often a graphic representation of *s* and not a combination of a dental with the *s* of a personal ending *st*.

Begemann's fifth argument against the composition theory, that the plurals belonging to the oldest preterits *mahta*, *brahta* (*mahtêdum*, *brahtêdum*), can never have had a *dêdum* in their earliest shape, is not a whit different from the third. It is anew the statement that the resemblance between participle and preterit is organic. When, however, he adduces the enigmatical *iddjêdum* as an argument for his view, he seems to believe, because he has one form in which the part of the verb most suggestive of composition no longer begins with a lingual mute, that he is justified in claiming it as a new argument for the derivation of preterit from participle. Were the parent participle here, or could its form be undeniably assumed from the other Germanic languages as coinciding in stem with *iddja*, we might concede force to the argument. But as the participle should end in *t*, at least in a lingual mute, it seems necessary to get rid of the *j*, and accordingly in one place the *j* is compelled to become inorganic, "ein ableitendes *j*." Nevertheless the argument as a whole professes great respect for the age and pedigree of the *j*, though rather more honor is paid to *d*, perhaps because most of the advocates of the composition theory have regarded the *dd* as as inorganic before and generated by the *j*. Müllenhoff makes the form *iddja* come from Sanskrit *ija*, *ijâja*, and supports the inorganic evolution or assumption of *dd* before *j* by the Gothic genitive *tvaddjê* and the substantive *vaddjus*. Begemann begins a long way off with his intrenchments to lay siege to the enemy's camp, namely with the Sanskrit comparative, which he assumes was formed by *idj*; so also was it in the Greek, ἰδιδίων, ἰδijών, ἰδιων, ἡδιον, and in Latin *mav-idjor*, *suav-idjor*, *suav-ijor*, *suavior*, *suavior*; Gothic *sut-idj-an*, *sut-izj-an*, *sut-iz-a(n)*. To the side of the Gothic *tvaddjê*, the Old Norse *tveggja* is summoned; both (it is claimed) can have had a nasal form as forerunner; one was *tvandjê*, the other *tvengja*; both of these can easily have come from *tvangdjê*, and a Gothic *tvandjê* for *tvangdjê* is compared with Latin

quintus for *quinctus* and has therefore "an absolutely certain analogue." *Fidvôr*, in Begemann's opinion, is perhaps from *findvor*, to which the corresponding Lithuanian form *keturi* certainly does not directly point. *Frijôn*, *fijan*, and the present optative of the Gothic *sein* (*sijan*) are also adduced to prove that there is a tendency to drop the *j*, though the greater number of cases in which it is preserved are said to show that it was "original." Therefore in *iddja* we must not suppose that a hypothetical *ija* has been loaded down with an inorganic *dd*. And at last Begemann tells us that he has the "boldness" to deny that the root *i* in Latin *ivi* (for instance) ever existed alone, and asserts that *d* has always belonged with it and that it was *idvi* formerly in Latin. Consequently, the *eode* of Anglo-Saxon belongs with *iddja*, and the mystery of the latter form is not merely cleared up, but its existence and descent disprove the composition theory. Begemann is by no means the first to connect Gothic *iddja* and Anglo-Saxon *eode*, and Grein's connection of the two words, deriving the Gothic from *idjan* or *ithjan*, and making *iddja* and *iddjêdum* transpositions for *idida* and *ididedum*, seems simpler than Begemann's primeval combination *dj*. Grein's theory (suggested also by Grimm) is mentioned in a note by Begemann, but we do not find any refutation of it in either treatise. Grein and Begemann are not very far apart in respect to this root. If the root is *id* and the *j* "ableitend," it is only in the evolution of the perfect that they differ, and Grein's hypothesis is worth just as much *for* the composition as Begemann's *against* it. Certainly no great argument can be drawn from *iddja* against the composition theory, for it is quite as explicable by this theory as by a reference to an unknown participle.

If, as Begemann says, *iddja* has been a "Schmerzenskind" to some of the composition champions, we must also concede to him a long parturition therewith, nor can we admit that his demonstrations are so convincing as to justify the statements on page 20 of the introduction to his second treatise. His poetical words are: "Men have played evil tricks with the poor innocent *iddja*; but why does it have the boldness

not to be willing to adapt itself to the theory? For that it must atone in the straight jacket. Yet linguistic facts do not allow themselves to be adapted to measuring rules; *iddja* remains *iddja* and *iddjêdum* remains *iddjêdum*; the endings *a* and *êdum* do not allow their true force to be explained away; they exist to all eternity. This is the most brilliant confirmation of my view and at the same time a witness against the assumed *dêdum* not to be killed." "Linguistic facts do not allow themselves to be adapted to measuring rules"; yet an anomalous *iddja* without any generating participle shall be claimed as the "most brilliant confirmation" of the theory that the weak preterit is the offspring of the participle. "Linguistic facts do not allow themselves to be adapted to measuring rules"; but the anomalous form *saisost* may dictate a second singular ending to the preterits of all strong verbs, and what was "in Old Norse only an occasional usage" shall, departing from this single form, be claimed as "eine durchgreifende Regel" in Gothic. "Linguistic facts do not allow themselves to be adapted to measuring rules"; but the *ddj* in *iddja* may suggest *dj* as a newly discovered method of comparison, and impose it on entire classes of Indo-Germanic comparatives!

But the seventh and crowning reason for the derivation of the weak preterit from the participle is the "quite particularly weighty fact that by the derivation from the participle all difficulties present themselves as quite natural appearances, and in general all is in the fairest order." So it seems to Begemann, but he admits the difficulty of the element *ed* inserted according to his theory before the personal endings of the dual and plural. He calls this difficulty "ein unschuldiger waisenknabe," "an innocent orphan boy," in comparison with the difficulties that beset the composition theory. Why he did not call it a girl (it would have been a more poetic picture), I do not know; but he calls it innocent, because in his judgment the mistakes of the advocates of the composition theory are flagrant; and he calls it an orphan because he does not wish to acknowledge it as his. It is a foundling whose father must be made responsible for it, and is an

insuperable hindrance to Begemann's withdrawing in triumph. Such a child unprovided and unaccounted for is an uncomfortable fact in his domestic economy. Begemann suggests its identification with the termination in *faheths*, but it is simply an accidental agreement of form without any support from analogy or meaning; indeed we understand him to claim that the meaning of the active preterit is deducible from the participle. Besides, not merely its appearance, but its appearance in dual and plural alone, just where it would belong on the correctness of that form of the composition theory which makes the *da* a strong preterit from the root *did*, is likewise a serious difficulty for Begemann to confront. Not to emphasize the fact that this increment, on our author's theory, would be anomalous in the Germanic languages, why should it appear simply in dual and plural? If the answer be that it is according to the analogy of strong preterits, we ask: Why then just the form *ed*? Does not this analogy with the strong preterits point to some intimate connection? and what will account for the *ed* but an actual strong preterit with that very form in dual and plural? Nor is the disappearance of the *ed* (if it really is not present) in Old High German and the kindred dialects, as Begemann claims, against its original existence as part of the form. Why not also assume that the dual cannot exist in Gothic, as it does not occur in the other Germanic dialects? If the dual fell out in Old High German why not also the *ed* (or better the syllable following it), a part used for the subordinate purpose of inflection? It is no argument to assert that if *neritum* in Old High German had once been *neritâtum*, the *tâ* would never have fallen out. Such a claim is against the teaching of compounds and derivatives in the Indo-Germanic family. Why not say that the Latin and Celtic could not have formed futures by adding *bhu* to the root of the present (*predicabit*, *predchibid*), because the full form of the root is not retained? Why not deny that perfects in Latin and Celtic (*mansimus*, *rogensam*) are formed with the root *as*? Why not claim that *fuo* could never become part of a Latin perfect, and the present and imperfect of *habeo* in the Romance languages could never

become in a mutilated form the endings of the future and conditional? Nor does it meet this objection to insist that the Germanic languages had another "betonungs-princip"; that the Old French *punir-avóns* is essentially different from Old German *neri-tátum*; for the termination *ons* is the same for many first plurals, and for the French ear it must have been as necessary to discriminate between *avóns* and *soyóns*, as for the German ear between *tátun* and *námun*.

One other difficulty in regard to the derivation of the weak preterit from the participle has been that of deriving an active, generally transitive, form from one commonly having a passive meaning. To remove this difficulty, which was but slightly considered in Begemann's first treatise, is the object of his more recent pamphlet, "Zur Bedeutung des schwachen Präteritums der Germanischen Sprachen." This treatise, like the other, shows great learning, and the collection of facts from the domain of the Indo-Germanic languages in regard to the relation of the active and the passive voices and the meaning of the past participle is valuable. Starting from the acute discussion of Dr. von der Gabelentz in the seventh volume of the proceedings of the Royal Saxon Scientific Society, who shows that the passive voice is rather a luxury than a necessity of language, Begemann endeavors to exhibit the evolution of the passive from the active. The first half of his treatise is devoted to the establishment of certain propositions. Passivity develops itself from activity through the medium of reflexiveness. Reflexiveness is expressed formally, or results from the conception ("vorstellung"), and remains unmarked. In the verb, the usage is various in this matter. In the noun, reflexiveness lies only in the conception. The first two of these propositions are virtually involved in Dr. von der Gabelentz's discussion and illustrations of the passive in the Indo-Germanic family (pp. 527-535). Ingenuity and power in their fuller development cannot be denied to Begemann, but it is worthy of note that the analysis of any form favoring even remotely the composition theory meets summary condemnation from our author: thus, the aorist passive *ἐτέθην*, which is held by some grammarians to be a compound of the

stem and the aorist ἔθηκεν with the meaning 'I placed' (so that ἐθέθηκεν would mean 'I placed to place myself,' 'I had myself placed,' or 'I was placed'), is pronounced to be simply a lengthened form of the aorist in ην. That the passive was developed from the active is possible. Many participles are cited in the second section of this treatise (pp. 92-124) from various languages of the Indo-Germanic group, in which an active meaning still inheres. From the Greek among others are mentioned τλητός, δυνατός, ἀδύνατος, ἐρπετός, λωβητός. From the Latin *potus*, *pransus*, *cenatus*, *peritus*, are familiar illustrations. When we come to the Gothic, Begemann's past participles with active meaning are few compared with those occurring in Greek, and into some of these few the activity is infused rather than inherent. Taking for instance *paufsts*, the past participle of *paurban*, which has the two meanings of 'needful' and 'useful' (if they are two), the activity of the latter 'that can be used' is not so prominent as to call for any explanation, or to go very far in accounting for the origin of active transitive preterits from past participles. However near one another active and passive may once have been, absolute original identity could not prove that, after they had once separated and the forms had received definite significations so opposed in nature as are the active and passive generally in the earliest records of our Indo-Germanic family, new forms of opposing meaning could be developed from either voice without any new element. This (if we understand the conditions) is the genesis which we are asked to accept, and this, even granting an age for the beginnings of Germanic speech surpassing that of the more eastern languages of the family, cannot become more than a doubtful possibility. It is also to be noted that the number of adjective-participles or participial adjectives having a meaning looking towards activity is much more numerous in the Middle High German than in the Old or the Gothic, though Begemann accounts for this by the comparatively abundant literary material of the Middle High German period.

It is from the highly interesting development of a participial perfect in the Iranian languages that Begemann derives his

main analogies for the assumed development in the Germanic languages. The facts exhibiting this development are mostly taken from the works of Spiegel, and are clearly presented in the third section of our author's second pamphlet. A brief outline of the facts shows; even in the old Persian and Bactrian, the past participle assuming verbal functions with both active and passive meaning, though in the latter case the auxiliary 'to be' is commonly used with the participle, while in the former the participle is used alone. By the side of these forms the old tenses of past time exist and indeed greatly preponderate. But in the younger Hûzvaresh the old forms of past tenses have been completely supplanted by the past participle. The meaning of the participle is still either active or passive. In the latter case, as before, the auxiliary is commonly found, and often another auxiliary is added to the former. But number and gender have disappeared from the participle form. The person is ascertained from the connection or indicated by a pronoun. The auxiliary, if present, of course denotes it. In the somewhat younger Parsi there are the same relations, but this progress—that the participle when used for the first person singular has assumed the personal ending (Bopp regarded it as a form of the verb 'to be'), which is wanting, if elsewhere indicated. In the new Persian the development is completed. Separate auxiliaries are used for the active and the passive forms, but the old simple participle stem is used only as an active, and has adopted, after the fashion of the first singular in Parsi, personal endings for each person, except the third singular which remains in the stem-form. Striking as the facts are, they are not new, but have long been familiar to the students of Indo-Germanic speech, and most familiar to those who have most firmly believed in the composition of the Germanic weak preterit. Bopp's "*Comparative Grammar*" records the facts, though not with Spiegel's minuteness. If these facts show the possibility of the derivation of a preterit from the past participle, it is to be noted that the participle maintained and exhibited from the first the active meaning which Begemann is obliged to assume for the Germanic participle. It is true

that in English active transitive verbs are in use from Latin past participles. It is true that in Middle and Old German present forms of transitive verbs have been in some cases derived from earlier participial or substantive forms, but to insist on the derivation of *all* transitive weak preterits from past participles whose early active meaning cannot be established, is to ask belief for something which the Iranian participle and its evolution cannot make probable. Nor does the illustration of the development of a preterit from a Hungarian participle (in a language that belongs to an entirely foreign family), though it is in its nature more analogous to the hypothetical development in the Germanic group, bring much support to the theory. Much nearer to the Germanic than the Persian even is the Slavo-Lithuanian branch of the Indo-Germanic family. It is the connecting link (if we may accept the statements of its expounders) between the Germanic and the Aryan members, both by grammar and word-fund. From the Lithuanian the composition theory receives a strong confirmation. Its imperfect of customary action is composed of the stem of the verb and the form *davan*. Whether this form be from the root *dha*, 'to place,' or not, there can be no doubt that this imperfect is formed by a composition of the stem with a past tense. However this intimate relationship between the Slavo-Lithuanian and the Germanic languages may be explained, whether by the influence, in a period later than the development of both languages, of Germanic authority over the Slavo-Lithuanian family, or by a community of the two stems at a period previous to the perfect development of either language, the *suk-davan* of the Lithuanian belongs with the *sôk-i-da* of the Gothic. The probability of the development of the Germanic weak preterit from the stem of the verb combined with the strong preterit of a verb from root *dha*, 'to place' or 'to do,' can hardly be doubted by one who gives proper weight to the formation of the Lithuanian imperfect and the relation of the languages of this group to the Germanic.

How then is the resemblance between the preterit and the past participle to be explained? If it be not accidental nor

organic, it must be incidental, it must have come from assimilation. Bopp's idea of a "Schutzbündniss," a "defensive alliance," has a poetical sound and is perhaps a fanciful presentation, but there must be truth behind it. Especially in the preteritive verbs, verbs of such great scope and repeated usage, there would be a constant tendency to assimilate a newer preterit *kunda* to an established form *kunps*, *magda* to *mahts*, *paurbda* to *paurfts*; and in cases where no participle had continued, analogy might have great force. In the case of the regular verbs, the resemblance is more apparent than real. Otherwise why should the termination *a* of the preterit go over into Old High German, and maintain itself so firmly, whereas the *a* of the present becomes *u*? Certainly there was something in that *a* of the preterit besides a simple personal ending or the *a* of a participial stem. This theory of assimilation finds analogies enough in the development of languages. Not to turn aside from these preteritive verbs, we see in English that the *l* in 'would' has forced its way into the preterit of 'can.' Into the present of *will* in old English the *o* of the preterit forced its way and produced a present *wol*, *wole*, which we have in 'I won't,' *I wol not*. That in the primitive period such an assimilation should take place, in case the meanings did not greatly differ, is quite conceivable. It is probably on this very ground of assimilation that we are to account for the loss of the final consonant in the singular, that is, the assimilation of the personal endings of the preterit to those of the present. Nor is there anything surprising in a double assimilation, an assimilation of personal ending to personal ending between preterit and present, and of preterit to participle in stem-form. That *nasidad* should become *nasida* by the side of *nasja*, and *nasidast* should become *nasidas* or *nasidês* by the side of *nasjis* is natural, and the theory of assimilation to the present, and a lengthening of the *a* in the second person singular seems more reasonable than Delbrück's ("Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie," vol. I., p. 128) assumption of a strong preterit *dad* resting upon *dadád* with the accent in *dádast* on the reduplication syllable after a Sanskrit analogy. To this assimilation the similarity

of the singular personal endings of the present in both strong and weak verbs might contribute, and the subordinate relation of the second part of the compound would invalidate any argument for permanence of form in the terminations derived from the strong preterit and hence sustained by a class feeling. The permanence in Old High German of the Gothic *a*, *ês*, *a*, as *a*, *ô*s, *a*, while the present ending *a* of both strong and weak verbs is reduced to *u*, is an evidence that the *a*, *ês*, *a* is something more than a simple personal ending. How *neritâtum* could become *neritum* may be to some inexplicable. We do not so regard it, and Seiler's explanation on p. 455 of "Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur" has much in its favor. That such a change did take place will be probable to him who carefully weighs the following considerations.

1. The Gothic dual and plural *nasidêdu*, *nasidêdum*, presuppose a singular *nasidad* compounded of the stem *nasi* and a strong preterit *dad*. This singular we have in the form *nasi-da*, *-dês*, *-da*. Corresponding with this, identical with it, we have *neri-ta*, *-tôs*, *-ta*, in Old High German.

2. The increment in the Gothic dual and plural cannot be accounted for on the supposition that the preterit is derived from the participle. Least of all can we thus explain the particular form *ed*, which is identical with the syllable corresponding in strong preterits derived from a stem ending in *d*.

3. The loss of a part of the stem or ending of the auxiliary, or a contraction or mutilation of the appended verb in the Old High German plural is natural, especially as the loss of the Gothic dual in the other Germanic languages shows an increasing tendency to disregard the fulness of the old inflectional forms.

4. The composed forms in Slavo-Lithuanic, the imperfect in *davan* and the participle in *damas*, nullify any probability of the derivation of the Germanic weak preterit from the past participle which might be deduced from facts in the Persian and Hungarian languages, as the Slavo-Lithuanian is the connecting link between the Germanic and the Aryan and much nearer the Germanic than the Iranian, and the Hunga-

rian (which belongs to the Finnish class) is still farther removed from the Germanic.

5. To render assurance still surer, it is noted that the transitive meaning of the Iranian participle finds no analogue in the Germanic.

6. The persistence of what are called the personal endings of the singular in the weak preterit in Old High German and Old Norse, involves fuller vowels and stronger elements than those of the ordinary personal endings (in the present for instance) will account for.

7. For the close resemblance of the stem-form in past participle and preterit, the theory of assimilation in the more striking cases is adequate. The close resemblance may then be incidental without excluding the possibility that in less striking cases, as in *nasida*, it is accidental. The accidental resemblance may have promoted the incidental.

8. The anomalous form *iddja* connected by etymologists doubtfully with Anglo-Saxon *eode* can just as well, even better, be regarded as a transposed form for *idida* and claimed as harmonious with the composition theory, than made a main foundation of Begemann's view, especially as no generating participle can be exhibited. It is not the enigmatical exceptions, but the prevailing regularities, that are most valuable in discovering a principle of form-genesis.

Even if we accept Begemann's ingenious explanation of the forms characterized by the *rückumlaut*, and regard them as of equal age or older than the regular weak forms, *santa* for instance as equally old with *sentita*, this does not establish the derivation of the preterit from the participle. Begemann's full and doubtless accurate collections of forms certainly indicate an age for the forms with the *rückumlaut* no less than that of the regular forms; but if these forms are even older than the more regular ones, when both occur, and if they agree with the participle, nothing justifies us in claiming that they are not compounded or in regarding them as an argument against composition. That the Old High German *dursta* by the side of Gothic *paursida* is from an obsolete present *durran* or *dursan*, and is of greater age than the Old Saxon *thurstida*,

even if it is proved, does not demonstrate that it itself is not a compound. On the contrary the advocate of the composition theory has the same right as Begemann to suppose two preterits developed at different times from or analogous to different stems, and is *not* obliged to contract Old High German *heftitātun*, corresponding to Gothic *haftidēdun*, into the West German *haftun* in order to enlarge it again to *heftitun*. The results of Begemann's investigations into the relations of these forms, even if correct, do no more than convict some advocates of the composition theory of inaccuracy in respect to the *time* of development of the forms. All that he has proved may be brought into harmony with the composition theory.

The object of this article causes us to stop short of any examination of Begemann's views in regard to the *ablaut*, the *lautverschiebung*, and the personal endings of the Indo-Germanic verb. But it may be remarked that our author is nothing if not revolutionary, and we may be thankful for the discussion of these old questions. We expect that this attempt at revolution, like every other that rests on any partially legitimate protest, will result in a readjustment of some relations between contending parties, but are confident that this bold assault on the composition theory, as applied to the weak preterits, will only show that the foundations cannot be shaken.